

On the long time behavior of Hilbert space diffusion

A. BASSI^{1,2} and D. DÜRR²

¹ *Department of Theoretical Physics, University of Trieste - Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy*

² *Mathematisches Institut der L.M.U. - Theresienstr. 39, 80333 München, Germany*

PACS 03.65.Ta – Foundations of quantum mechanics; measurement theory

PACS 02.50.Ey – Stochastic processes

PACS 02.30.Jr – Partial differential equations

Abstract. - Stochastic differential equations in Hilbert space as random nonlinear modified Schrödinger equations have achieved great attention in recent years; of particular interest is the long time behavior of their solutions. In this note we discuss the long time behavior of the solutions of the stochastic differential equation describing the time evolution of a free quantum particle subject to spontaneous collapses in space. We explain why the problem is subtle and report on a recent rigorous result, which asserts that any initial state converges almost surely to a Gaussian state having a fixed spread both in position and momentum.

Hilbert space valued stochastic differential equations appear all over in quantum physics and their meaning ranges from fundamental to effective descriptions of quantum systems. They can on the one hand be seen as basic equations in collapse models, where the aim is to find a unified description of microscopic quantum phenomena and macroscopic classical ones; this is achieved by modifying the Schrödinger equation, adding stochastic nonlinear terms which model the spontaneous collapse of the wave function [1–10]. This fundamental meaning of Hilbert space diffusions have been originated in a discrete version, the so called GRW model [1], which relies on jump processes rather than a continuous diffusion process. One can view the diffusion process as continuum limit of the GRW jump process [2]; whether they can be empirically distinguished is unclear. Mathematically, diffusion processes are analytically easier to handle than jump processes: that is the reason why we consider diffusions.

The same type of equations occur in the theory of continuous measurement [11–15]; in this context, they describe the effect of continuous measurements on the evolution of quantum systems. Synonymous to measurement is decoherence, and therefore the very same effective equations appear also in decoherence theory [16, 17].

used in Quantum Mechanics has the following structure:

$$d\psi_t = \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} H dt + \sqrt{\lambda} \sum_n (L_n - \langle L_n \rangle_t) dW_t^{(n)} - \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_n (L_n - \langle L_n \rangle_t)^2 dt \right] \psi_t, \quad (1)$$

with $\langle L_n \rangle_t = \langle \psi_t | L_n | \psi_t \rangle$. The equation is defined on a suitable domain of a complex separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$; it is manifestly non-linear, but preserves the norm of the state vector. H is the standard quantum Hamiltonian, $\{L_n\}$ is a set of commuting self-adjoint operators, λ is a positive constant and $\{W_t^{(n)}\}$ is a family of independent standard Wiener process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Eq. (1) can be generalized in several different ways, e.g. by considering non self-adjoint collapsing operators, nevertheless the basic structure is preserved.

One of the most relevant problems in the study of this type of equations is to analyze the behavior of their solutions over characteristic time regimes. The idea, which is also been put forward in the context of the classical limit of quantum mechanics [18], is that there are three time regimes, more or less sharply separated, which characterize the time evolution of the solution. 1. *Collapse regime*: That is the regime, during which a superposition of eigenstates of $\{L_n\}$ collapses to one eigenstate, with a probability close to the Born probability rule. This feature is a consequence of the martingale structure [4] of the non-Schrödinger terms of Eq. (1). In collapse models,

The common class of stochastic differential equations

the operators $\{L_n\}$ are functions of the position operators [2, 4, 6, 8, 9], so the wave function collapses in space; the constant λ is chosen in such a way that, for macroscopic systems, the collapse occurs almost instantaneously. In decoherence models instead the collapse time is given by the parameters characterizing the interaction with the environment [19, 20]. 2. *Classical regime*: The collapsed wave packet moves classically; the dynamical equations are still stochastic, but the fluctuations around the average values—which evolve classically—are very small and can be neglected for all practical purposes [2, 8]. 3. *Diffusive regime*: Eventually, however, the diffusive effect of randomness takes over and the third time regime begins; the collapsed wave packet starts to diffuse, departing from the classical motion. In models of environment-induced collapse the diffusion is paired with friction and the classical trajectory goes over into a Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type of diffusion. At the end of this note we will come back again on these regimes, and will give numerical estimates showing how they are characterized and separated one from the other. The long time regime, which we are concerned with in this paper, corresponds to the diffusive one. It is the one which can be most easily singled out and treated rigorously.

These time regimes have been studied in particular in connection with the following equation, defined in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R})$:

$$d\psi_t = \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \frac{p^2}{2m} dt + \sqrt{\lambda} (q - \langle q \rangle_t) dW_t - \frac{\lambda}{2} (q - \langle q \rangle_t)^2 dt \right] \psi_t; \quad (2)$$

q is the position operator and p the momentum operator. The equation describes the time evolution of the wave function of a free quantum particle subject to spontaneous localizations in space. Its importance lies in the fact that it is simple enough to be analyzed in full mathematical detail; at the same time it is physically interesting and gives deep insight in understanding the behavior of more complex physical situations. We mention here in particular the results of [21] and [10]: in the first case, it has been shown in mathematical detail how collapse models ensure definite outcomes in measurements on quantum systems; in the second case, it has been proven how the entire quantum formalism (measurable quantities as self-adjoint operators on Hilbert spaces) follows from the basic structure of the dynamics of collapse models. In this way the dynamical reduction program, initiated with the original paper of GRW, finds its completion as a consistent alternative to standard quantum mechanics, at least at the non relativistic level.

One of the most treated problems in connection with Eq. (2), as we said, is to establish rigorously the long time behavior of its solution [6, 8, 12, 16, 22–24]. We report here on a mathematical treatment of this equation where the asymptotic behavior is fully and rigorously es-

tablished [25], correcting gaps in earlier works. At the end we will also discuss the three above mentioned time regimes in physical units, and we will see how they depend on the parameters λ and m defining the model. The main result of [25] is contained in the following theorem:

THEOREM: Let ψ_t be the solution of Eq. (2), for the given initial condition $\psi \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R})$, $\|\psi\| = 1$. Then, with $\mathbb{P}$ -probability 1:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left\| \psi_t - \psi_{\bar{x}_t, \bar{k}_t, c_t}^G \right\| = 0, \quad (3)$$

with:

$$\psi_{\bar{x}_t, \bar{k}_t, c_t}^G(x) := \exp \left[-\frac{z^2}{2} (x - \bar{x}_t)^2 + i \bar{k}_t x + c_t \right], \quad (4)$$

$$z^2 := (1 - i) \sqrt{\frac{\lambda m}{\hbar}}, \quad (5)$$

where $\bar{x}_t, \bar{k}_t$ are real stochastic processes, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_t &= X + \frac{\hbar}{m} K t + \sqrt{\lambda} \frac{\hbar}{m} \int_0^t W_s ds + \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{m}} W_t \\ &\quad + O(e^{-\omega t/2}), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\bar{k}_t = K + \sqrt{\lambda} W_t + O(e^{-\omega t/2}), \quad (7)$$

where X and K are two time-independent random variables, while c_t is a complex stochastic process and $\omega = 2\sqrt{\hbar\lambda/m}$. Of course, c_t is such that $\psi_{\bar{x}_t, \bar{k}_t, c_t}^G$ is always correctly normalized.

The above theorem states a remarkable property of Eq. (2): with $\mathbb{P}$ -probability 1 any solution of equation (2) converges in the large time limit to a *Gaussian* solution having a *fixed spread* both in position and momentum, while the mean in position $\bar{x}_t$ as well as the mean in momentum $\hbar \bar{k}_t$ undergo a random motion guided by W_t .

Instead of elaborating on the mathematical technicalities which enter the result [25], we would like to explain why mathematical rigor is needed to get to a trustable understanding. For that, we explain first what goes wrong with “intuitive” arguments which have been used in the literature, which sound convincing but which nevertheless are problematic.

An argument which has been used in [5–8, 16] to set the asymptotic behavior of Eq. (2) and of more general equations of the type (1) is based on the large time behavior of the variance $\Delta A_t^2 \equiv \|(A - \langle A \rangle_t) \psi_t\|^2$ of a suitably chosen linear operator A , not necessarily self-adjoint. Let us assume that the solution ψ_t of Eq. (1) is such that the variance, computed on this state, asymptotically vanishes:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Delta A_t^2 = 0. \quad (8)$$

Since ψ is an eigenstate of A if and only if the variance ΔA^2 is zero for such a state, it seems reasonable to conclude that, when (8) holds, ψ_t converges to an eigenstate

of A , which would be the desired result. E.g., in the case of Eq. (2) the operator A such that (8) is satisfied is [8,16]:

$$A := q - \frac{z^2}{2\lambda m} p, \quad (9)$$

which has precisely the coherent states $\psi_{a,b,c}^G$ defined in (4), with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, as eigenstates.

The above argument is indeed true when $\mathcal{H}$ has *finite* dimension and A is a self-adjoint operator. Let us in fact denote by a_n its eigenvalues and by ϕ_n the corresponding eigenvectors; for simplicity we assume no degeneracy in the spectrum of A . From Eq. (8) one trivially has:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} |c_n(t)|^2 [a_n - \langle A \rangle_t]^2 = 0 \quad \forall n \quad (10)$$

with $c_n(t) = \langle \phi_n | \psi_t \rangle$. Since the coefficients $|c_n(t)|^2$ sum up to 1 for any time t , and since $\langle A \rangle_t$ has a unique limit (when it exists), then Eq. (10) implies that there exists a $\bar{n}$ such that $|c_n(t)|^2 \rightarrow \delta_{\bar{n},n}$ and $\langle A \rangle_t \rightarrow a_{\bar{n}}$. As a consequence $\phi_{\bar{n}}$ is the eigenstate towards which ψ_t converges.

The above argument fails to apply in the infinite dimensional case. As a counterexample, let us consider any orthonormal basis $\{\phi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of an infinite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and let A be a self-adjoint operator having ϕ_n has eigenstates relative to the real eigenvalues a_n . Let us consider the following sequence of vectors:

$$\psi_n = \alpha_n \phi_n + \beta_n \phi_{n+1}, \quad |\alpha_n|^2 + |\beta_n|^2 = 1. \quad (11)$$

It is easy to show that $\Delta A_n^2 = |\alpha_n|^2 |\beta_n|^2 (a_{n+1} - a_n)^2$, which asymptotically goes to 0 as soon as $(a_{n+1} - a_n) \rightarrow 0$ for $t \rightarrow +\infty$, without requiring that either α_n or β_n asymptotically vanishes. In other words, the variance of A goes to zero while the ψ_n need not approach any of the eigenstates.

The reason why the above proof breaks down in infinite dimensional spaces is that the spectrum of an operator may have an accumulation point, or may be continuous—which is actually the case with the operator A defined in (9)—in which case the proof for the finite-dimensional case does not hold anymore. The physical reason instead is that, for such a kind of an operator, the variance, though vanishingly small, is always bigger than the difference between two eigenvalues, and thus it cannot discriminate between the corresponding two eigenstates.

There is a second argument which has been used to study the solution of Eq. (2), in particular its long time behavior, which relies on its expansion in terms of coherent states. It is known [8,13,22–24,26] that Gaussian wave functions are solutions of Eq. (2). To see this, let us consider the following linear stochastic differential equation:

$$d\phi_t(x) = \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \frac{p^2}{2m} dt + \sqrt{\lambda} q d\xi_t - \frac{\lambda}{2} q^2 dt \right] \phi_t(x), \quad (12)$$

where ξ_t is a standard Wiener process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{Q})$. The square norm $\|\phi_t\|^2$ is a martingale [26,27] solving the stochastic differential equation

$d\|\phi_t\|^2 = 2\sqrt{\lambda} \langle q \rangle_t \|\phi_t\|^2 d\xi_t$, and it can be used as a Radon-Nikodym derivative of a new probability measure. Let us choose $\mathbb{Q}$ in such a way that $d\mathbb{P}/d\mathbb{Q} = \|\phi_t\|^2$; Girsanov's theorem implies that the two Wiener processes W_t and ξ_t are related as follows [26,27]: $dW_t = d\xi_t - 2\sqrt{\lambda} \langle q \rangle_t dt$. Given these results, a straightforward application of Itô calculus shows that if ϕ_t solves Eq. (12), then $\psi_t = \phi_t / \|\phi_t\|$ solves Eq. (2). In other words, one can work with Eq. (12)—which is *linear*—and, at the end, normalize the wave function and replace ξ_t with W_t according to the previous formula in order to get the corresponding solution of Eq. (2), for any suitable initial state.

Direct substitution shows that Gaussian wave functions

$$\phi_t(x) = \exp \left[-\alpha_t (x - x_t^m)^2 + i k_t^m x + \gamma_t \right], \quad (13)$$

solve Eq. (12), if x_t^m , k_t^m , γ_t solve suitable stochastic differential equations which we do not report here (see e.g. [8,26] and references therein), while α_t solves the deterministic equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \alpha_t = \lambda - \frac{2i\hbar}{m} \alpha_t^2. \quad (14)$$

This equation has the nice feature that $\alpha_t \rightarrow z^2/2$ for $t \rightarrow +\infty$, for any initial condition α_0 . In other words, *any* initial Gaussian wave function converges, in the long time limit, to a wave function of the type (4). Since $\mathcal{L}^2$ -functions can be expressed in terms of coherent states as follows:

$$\phi(x) = \int dx_0^m dk_0^m f(x_0^m, k_0^m) \exp \left[-\alpha_0 (x - x_0^m)^2 + i k_0^m x \right], \quad (15)$$

then using linearity of Eq. (12) and the asymptotic behavior of α_t , one is tempted to conclude that also the general solution of Eq. (2) converges to a Gaussian state of the type (4). This argument has been used e.g. in [11,23]. This conclusion however is false in general.

That it is false may be seen by scrutinizing the physically interesting example of the non-linear but norm-preserving differential equation in $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R})$:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \psi_t(x) = \left[-\frac{i}{\hbar} \frac{p^2}{2m} - \lambda(q^2 - \langle q^2 \rangle_t) \right] \psi_t(x). \quad (16)$$

The Schrödinger term spreads out the wave function along the real axis while the other two terms localize it in space (the effect of $\langle q^2 \rangle_t$ is to keep the norm of ψ_t constant in time); these two effect are opposite to each other and thus cancel when an equilibrium is reached. It is then reasonable to expect that any initial wave function reaches asymptotically such an equilibrium, i.e. it approaches a wave function whose spread is the result of the compromise between the two competing effects. Note that this is precisely the kind of intuition concerning the large time behavior of the solutions of Eq. (2).

It is easy to show that a Gaussian wave functions of the type (13) are solutions of Eq. (16) if α_t solves Eq. (14),

while x_t^m , k_t^m and γ_t satisfy the following equations:

$$\frac{d}{dt} x_t^m = \frac{\hbar}{m} k_t^m - \frac{\lambda}{\alpha_t^R} x_t^m, \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} k_t^m = 2\lambda \frac{\alpha_t^I}{\alpha_t^R} x_t^m, \quad (18)$$

the symbols α_t^R and α_t^I denote respectively the real and imaginary parts of α_t . The two equations for x_t^m and k_t^m imply that both these quantities vanish for large times. We then have the following result: *any* initial Gaussian solution asymptotically converges towards a Gaussian wave function centered in the origin of both the position and the momentum space, and with a fixed spread equal to $z^2/2$. We are then precisely in the situation described before, which seems to indicate that any solution of Eq. (16)—at least those which can be initially written as in (15)—converges asymptotically to a Gaussian state with a fixed spread. However, we show that this is not true by explicitly finding the general solution of Eq. (16).

Such an equation can be easily solved by first considering the following linear equation:

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} \phi_t(x) = \left[\frac{p^2}{2m} - i\hbar\lambda q^2 \right] \phi_t(x); \quad (19)$$

it is immediate to show that if ϕ_t solves Eq. (19), then $\psi_t = \phi_t/\|\phi_t\|$ (assuming that $\phi_t \neq 0$) solves Eq. (16). The above equation describes the so called non-self-adjoint (NSA) harmonic oscillator and has been already considered in the literature [28], and its general solution is known. The *eigenvalues* of the operator $H = p^2/2m - i\hbar\lambda q^2$ are:

$$\lambda_n = \frac{1-i}{2} \hbar\omega_n, \quad \omega_n = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \omega, \quad \omega = 2\sqrt{\frac{\hbar\lambda}{m}} \quad (20)$$

and the corresponding *eigenvectors* are:

$$u_n(x) \equiv \sqrt{z} \exp \left[-\frac{z^2}{2} x^2 \right] \overline{H}_n(zx), \quad (21)$$

where $\overline{H}_n(x)$ is the normalized Hermite polynomial of degree n . The general solution of Eq. (19) can then be written as a superposition of the states:

$$\phi_t^{(n)}(x) = \exp \left[-\frac{1+i}{2} \omega_n t \right] u_n(x), \quad (22)$$

and the corresponding solution of Eq. (16) can be obtained by dividing $\phi_t(x)$ by its norm; in particular, the normalized states $\psi_t^{(n)}(x) = \phi_t^{(n)}(x)/\|\phi_t^{(n)}\|$ are *stationary* solutions of Eq. (16) for any value of n , as the modulus $|\phi_t^{(n)}(x)|$ is constant in time: this in particular means that they never approach a Gaussian state, with the only exception of the ground state $\psi_t^{(0)}(x)$ which is already a Gaussian function.

One can easily understand that if ϕ_t is a superposition of eigenstates $\phi_t^{(n)}$ with $n \in \mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, then the normalized state ψ_t approaches for large times the stationary

state $\psi_t^{(\overline{n})}$ such that $\overline{n} = \min\{n, n \in \mathcal{N}\}$. In fact, the non-normalized eigenstate $\phi_t^{(\overline{n})}$ is the one with the weakest time dependent damping factor; accordingly, when one normalizes ϕ_t to obtain ψ_t , this is the only term of the superposition for which the damping factor cancels out, while all other terms keep an exponential factor proportional to $\exp[-(\omega_n - \omega_{\overline{n}})t/2]$. This means that Eq. (16) has not only one stationary state, but infinitely many, since for any single-eigenstate solution the damping factor is canceled by the normalization.

The above analysis disproves the physical intuition about the equation and the argument according to which properties of Gaussian states are sufficient to analyze the behavior of the general solution. The reason why, in this case, Gaussian wave functions do not provide a complete description is that they always have a non-zero component with respect to the ground state $\psi_t^{(0)}$ so they necessarily converge towards it. But this excludes the situation in which the initial wave function does have a null component on such a state. Note also that the states $\psi_t^{(n)}$ have a bigger spread, the bigger the value of n ; accordingly, it is not even true that Eq. (16) localizes wave functions in space, below a fixed spread.

From a more mathematical point of view, the reason why the analysis of the long time behavior in terms of coherent states leads to the wrong conclusion is rather subtle; we exemplify this by considering the first eigenstate $u_1(x)$. Such a state can be expressed as in (15): the Gaussian term $\exp[-\alpha_0(x - x_0^m)^2 + ik_0^m x]$ evolves to a state of the form (13), where α_t , x_t^m and k_0^m solve Eqs. (14), (17) and (18), respectively, while γ_t solves the following equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \gamma_t = \lambda \left[1 - 2 \frac{\alpha_t}{\alpha_t^R} \right] (x_t^m)^2 - \frac{i\hbar}{2m} (k_t^m)^2 - \frac{i\hbar}{m} \alpha_t. \quad (23)$$

The function $f(x_0^m, k_0^m)$ is highly undetermined, as the Gaussian states form an over-complete set; nevertheless it has the symmetry property: $f(x_0^m, k_0^m) = -f(-x_0^m, -k_0^m)$, since $u_1(x) = -u_1(-x)$. Then the state at time t reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t^{(1)}(x) &= \int dx_0^m dk_0^m f(x_0^m, k_0^m) \exp[\gamma_t] \\ &\quad \cdot \exp[-\alpha_t(x - x_t^m)^2 + ik_t^m x]; \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

since x_t^m and k_t^m tend to 0 asymptotically, it seems reasonable that the second exponential can be easily taken out of the integral, so to speak. What is left however is the integral of an odd function—as one can see from Eq. (23), the global factor γ_t is even in the initial conditions x_0^m, k_0^m —which of course is zero. Therefore the large time behavior requires much more scrutiny and cannot be read off from the “zeroth-order approximation”.

The above discussion is useful not only because it shows that care must be taken when analyzing the large time behavior of the solutions of Eq. (2), but also because it helps in understanding what actually happens in this case. As proven in [25] each solution solution of Eq. (12), from

which the corresponding solution of Eq. (2) can be directly obtained, can be mapped into a solution of Eq. (19) and can be written as follows:

$$\phi_t(x) = e^{i\bar{k}_t x + \gamma_t} \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \bar{\alpha}_t^{(n)} \phi_t^{(n)}(x - \bar{x}_t), \quad (25)$$

where $\phi_t^{(n)}(x)$ are exactly the eigenstates of the NSA harmonic oscillator defined in (22), while $\bar{x}_t$ and $\bar{k}_t$ are the stochastic processes introduced in (6) and (7), and γ_t is a new stochastic process function of c_t appearing in (4); moreover

$$\bar{\alpha}_t^{(n)} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \alpha_{k+n} \frac{\sqrt{(k+n)!}}{\sqrt{n!k!}} (\sqrt{2}z\bar{\zeta}_t)^k, \quad (26)$$

$\bar{\zeta}_t$ being another stochastic process; the complex terms α_m are the coefficients of the superposition of the initial state ϕ_0 in terms of the eigenstates $\phi_0^{(m)} \equiv u_m$.

A crucial point is that the series defined in (25) is norm convergent *only* for $t > (4c+1)/\omega$, where c is a constant. This means that the representation of the general solution of Eq. (12) given in (25) is suitable only for studying the large time behavior of ψ_t solution of Eq. (2), not its properties at finite small (compared to ω) times, which are also very interesting—even more interesting than the long time behavior, from a physical point of view—as discussed in [25].

As we can see from (25), the collapse mechanism is basically the same as in the previous example of Eq. (16): $\psi_t = \phi_t / \|\phi_t\|$ converges to the lowest non-vanishing eigenstate appearing in the sum (25), which is the only one whose exponential damping factor is fully canceled by normalization. However, a crucial difference with respect to the solutions of Eq. (16) occurs, which is embodied in the form (26) of the coefficients $\bar{\alpha}_t^{(m)}$: *whichever* the initial condition, due to the *Brownian motion* the solution ϕ_t of Eq. (12) always picks a non-vanishing component on the *ground state* (i.e. $\bar{\alpha}_t^{(0)} \neq 0$ a.s., for any $t > 0$); accordingly, the normalized solution ψ_t converges almost surely towards such a state. This is how the asymptotic convergence of the general solution of Eq. (2) towards a Gaussian state occurs. The detailed analysis can be found in [25].

DISCUSSION OF THE TIME REGIMES. We conclude this note by showing how one can read from (25) the three time regimes we mentioned at the beginning, which depict the main features of the evolution of the solution ψ_t of Eq. (2). As discussed e.g. in [8], it is physically convenient to take λ proportional to the mass m of the particle, according to the formula:

$$\lambda = \lambda_0 \frac{m}{m_0}, \quad (27)$$

where m_0 is a reference mass and λ_0 is the universal coupling constant which applies to all systems. Accordingly, m is the only free parameter of the model. The above assumption embodies the fact that, for a composite system,

the coupling constant λ_{cm} associated to the motion of the center of mass of the systems turns out to be the sum of the coupling constants λ_i associated to the motion of each constituent. In models of wave function collapse—which are the only ones we will refer to, in the following—in order for the collapse mechanism to have the same strength of that of the original GRW model [1], one has to set $\lambda_0 \simeq 1.00 \times 10^{-2} \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ when m_0 is taken equal to the mass of a nucleon ($\simeq 1.67 \times 10^{-27} \text{ Kg}$).

The first important point to stress is that the series in (25) is convergent only for $t > \bar{t} := (4c+1)/\omega$; since c is of order 1 and $\omega \simeq 5.01 \times 10^{-5} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ (in a GRW-like scenario), then $\bar{t} \simeq 2.00 \times 10^4 \text{ sec}$. As we shall soon see, this implies that the representation (25) is valid only for the classical and diffusive regime, to which the long time behavior belongs. If one wants to analyze the collapse regime and possibly the onset of classical motion other representations of the solution must be used, e.g. the one in terms of the Green's function. Given this, here we shall use (25) to describe all three time regimes, keeping in mind that, for $t \leq \bar{t}$, the representation (25) makes sense only if a finite sum of terms appears. This is nevertheless sufficient to describe, qualitatively, the time evolution of the solution of Eq. (2).

According to Eq. (22), the n -th term of the series (25) defining ϕ_t decays exponentially in a time equal to $1/n\omega$, which means that after a given time T all terms with $n > 1/\omega T$ have decayed. This is the *collapse regime*, previously introduced: any initially spread out wave function collapses in space. However, according to (20) the frequency ω depends on the ration λ/m and thus is independent of the mass of the particle: this means that both for micro- and for macro-objects the eigenstates decay in the same way; in particular, in a GRW-like model, after a time $T \simeq 10^{-3} \text{ sec}$, which is about the perception time of a human being, only the states with $n > 2.00 \times 10^7$ have decayed. This is a very large number, which seems not to justify the reason why, according the collapse models, the wave function collapses the faster, the bigger the system.

However, the parameter z^2 defined in (4), which sets the width of the eigenstates u_n of the NSA harmonic oscillator through Eq. (21), grows linearly with m . This implies that the spread in position σ_q^n of the state u_n decreases with the mass according to the formula:

$$\sigma_q^n \Big|_{\text{mass} = m} = \sqrt{\frac{m_0}{m}} \sigma_q^n \Big|_{\text{mass} = m_0}. \quad (28)$$

Accordingly, after a given time T , the states with $n < 1/\omega T$ which have survived the collapse, all have a spread, which is the smaller, the bigger the system, and thus sum up to form a wave function whose extension, for fixed T , decreases as m increases. This is how the amplification mechanism works, which says that the *collapse regime* is shorter, the bigger the mass of the system. This behavior can be seen also by inspecting directly Eq. (2): if one performs the replacement $x \rightarrow y = \sqrt{m/m_0} x$, then the

dependence of the equation on m disappears. This means that the only effect of the mass is to “shrink” the wave function in space, not to influence directly its collapse in time. The fact that the collapse occurs in good agreement with the Born probability rule is not so easy to see; ref. [25] contains a discussion of this point.

Let us now consider the case of a macroscopic particle and let us suppose that the wave function has collapsed to a function which, on macroscopic scales, is almost point-like. Then, within macroscopic scales, the average value $\langle q \rangle_t$ and $\langle p \rangle_t$ of the position and momentum operators, respectively, are practically equal to $\bar{x}_t$ and $\hbar \bar{k}_t$ defined in (6) and (7), i.e. with the average position and momentum of the Gaussian ground state. We can then analyze $\bar{x}_t$ and $\hbar \bar{k}_t$ in place of $\langle q \rangle_t$ and $\langle p \rangle_t$; e.g. let us consider the time evolution of $\bar{x}_t$.

As we see from Eq. (6), the deterministic part of the evolution corresponds to the solution of Newton’s laws, while the random part of the evolution is proportional to $m^{-1/2}$, thus it is suppressed for large systems. E.g.: $\sqrt{\lambda} \hbar / m \simeq 2.57 \times 10^{-19} \text{ m sec}^{-3/2}$ and $\sqrt{\hbar / m} \simeq 3.24 \times 10^{-16} \text{ m sec}^{-1/2}$, for a 1-g object. The figures show that for very long times the (almost point-like) wave function moves practically along a straight line, like a classical particle. This corresponds to the *classical regime*, where the motion is essentially classical. This regime last the longer, the bigger the system; for macroscopic systems, as the numerical example shows, it is much longer than the time during which the system can be kept isolated, so that its dynamics can be described by Eq. (2).

The classical regime ends when the fluctuations become relevant on a macroscopic scale, i.e. essentially when $W_t \sim \sqrt{m/\hbar}$ which is about $9.53 \times 10^{10} \text{ sec}$ if we take Angström units for length. After this time, the fluctuations start to blur the deterministic motion: this is what we have called the *diffusive regime*, which dominates the remaining evolution of the wave function.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. We thank P. Pickl for very useful discussions. The work was supported by the EU grant MEIF CT 2003–500543 and by DFG (Germany).

REFERENCES

- [1] G.C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini and T. Weber, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 470 (1986).
- [2] G.C. Ghirardi, P. Pearle and A. Rimini, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 78 (1990).
- [3] G.C. Ghirardi, R. Grassi and P. Pearle, Found. Phys. **20**, 1271 (1990). A. Bassi and G.C. Ghirardi, Phys. Rept. **379**, 257 (2003).
- [4] P. Pearle, Phys. Rev. D **13**, 857 (1976); Found. Phys. **12**, 249 (1982); Phys. Rev. D **29**, 235 (1984); Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1775 (1984); Phys. Rev. A **39**, 2277 (1989).
- [5] N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1657 (1984); Helvet. Phys. Acta **62**, 363 (1989). N. Gisin and I. Percival, Journ. Phys. A **25**, 5677 (1992); Journ. Phys. A **26**, 2233 (1993).
- [6] L. Diósi, Phys. Lett. A **132**, 233 (1988); Phys. Rev. A **40**, 1165 (1989).
- [7] S.L. Adler and L.P. Howritz, Journ. Math. Phys. **41**, 2485 (2000). S.L. Adler and T.A. Brun, Journ. Phys. A **34**, 4797 (2001). S.L. Adler, Journ. Phys. A **35**, 841 (2002).
- [8] A. Bassi, Journ. Phys. A **38** 3173 (2005).
- [9] A. Bassi and E. Ippoliti, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 012105 (2004). A. Bassi, E. Ippoliti and S.L. Adler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 030401 (2005). A. Bassi, E. Ippoliti and S.L. Adler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 030401 (2005). S.L. Adler, *Quantum Theory as an emergent phenomenon*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2004). A. Bassi, E. Ippoliti and B. Vacchini, Journ. Phys. A **38** 8017 (2005).
- [10] A. Bassi, G.C. Ghirardi, D.G.M. Salvetti, *Journ. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **40**, 13755 (2007).
- [11] V.P. Belavkin and P. Staszewski, Phys. Lett. A **140**, 359 (1989); Phys. Rev. A **45**, 1347 (1992).
- [12] D. Chruściński and P. Staszewski, Physica Scripta **45**, 193 (1992).
- [13] V.P. Belavkin, in *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Science* **121**, A. Blaquiére ed., 245 (1988).
- [14] A. Barchielli, Quantum Opt. **2**, 423 (1990); Rep. Math. Phys. **33**, 21 (1993). A. Barchielli and A.S. Holevo, Stoch. Proc. Appl. **58**, 293 (1995). A. Barchielli, in: *Contributions in Probability*, Udine, Forum (1996). A.S. Holevo, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **104**, 483 (1996).
- [15] Ph. Blanchard and A. Jadczyk, Phys. Lett. A **175**, 157 (1993); Ann. der Physik **4**, 583 (1995); Phys. Lett. A **203**, 260 (1995).
- [16] J. Halliwell and A. Zoupas, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 7294 (1995), Phys. Rev. D **55**, 4697 (1997).
- [17] H.P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, Oxford University Press (2003).
- [18] M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3345 (1993).
- [19] D. Dürr and H. Spohn, in: *Decoherence: Theoretical, Experimental, and Conceptual Problems*, Ph. Blanchard et al. eds., *Lecture Notes in Physics* **538**, 77 (1999).
- [20] D. Dürr, Figari, and A. Teta, *J. Math. Phys.* **45**, 1291 (2004).
- [21] A. Bassi and D.G.M. Salvetti, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 9859 (2007).
- [22] V.P. Belavkin and V.N. Kolokoltsov, Teor. Math. Phys. **89**, 1127 (1991). V.N. Kolokoltsov, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 2741 (1995).
- [23] V.N. Kolokol’tsov, Rev. Math. Phys. **10**, 801 (1998).
- [24] V.N. Kolokol’tsov, *Semiclassical Analysis for Diffusions and Stochastic Processes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1724**, Springer (2000).
- [25] A. Bassi, D. Dürr and M. Kolb *On the long time behavior of stochastic Schrödinger evolutions*, in preparation.
- [26] D. Gatarek and N. Gisin, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 2152 (1991).
- [27] A.S. Holevo, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **104**, 483 (1996).
- [28] E. B. Davies, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **455**, 585 (1999). E. B. Davies and A. B. J. Kuijlaars, J. London Math. Soc. **70**, 420 (2004). E. B. Davies, *Linear operators and their spectra*, Cambridge University Press (2007).